



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

2 NAVY ANNEX

WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

JLP:ddj

Docket No: 1633-00

20 June 2000

[REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the United States Code, section 1552.

[REDACTED]

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 20 June 2000. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies. In addition, the Board considered the advisory opinion furnished by BUPERS memorandum 1780 PERS 604 of 9 May 2000, a copy of which is attached.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. In this connection, the Board substantially concurred with the comments contained in the advisory opinion. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director

Enclosure



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NAVY PERSONNEL COMMAND
5720 INTEGRITY DRIVE
MILLINGTON TN 38055-0000

1780
PERS-604
9 May 00

MEMORANDUM FOR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF
NAVAL RECORDS

Via: Assistant for BCNR Matters (PERS-00ZCB)

Subj: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ICO [REDACTED]

Ref: (a) CNPC memo 5420 PERS-00ZCB of 14 Apr 00
(b) Title 38, United States Code, Chapter 30

1. The following is provided in response to reference (a):

a. Recommend the Board deny [REDACTED] request to add Navy College Fund (NCF) Program guarantee as an enlistment option to her master record. NCF Program is offered only at the time of enlistment to some recruits who enlist in critical or hard-to-fill ratings and meet the basic criteria outlined in reference (b). NCF Program recipients receive an extra kicker payment in addition to Montgomery GI Bill (MGIB) Program entitlements. Fiscal and/or quota constraints prevent NCF Program from being offered to every recruit since NCF Program, unlike MGIB Program, is funded solely by Navy. Because of this, NCF Program is given only at the discretion of the classifier. A change in active duty date, or skill guarantee can affect availability of NCF, which is why a recruit is asked to recertify guarantees in block 33 of the Enlistment Document (DD Form 1966) upon reporting to active duty.

b. [REDACTED] active duty date changed several times affecting her NCF Program guarantee. A review of DD Form 4 (Enlistment/Reenlistment Document) in [REDACTED] master record indicates on 6 May 1994, she was guaranteed "Three Year Obligation-Airman Apprenticeship Training Program." HT2 Titus was reclassified on 13 July 1994 and guaranteed "Three Year Navy College Fund Program-Airman Apprentice Training." She was reclassified again on 22 July 1994 and guaranteed "Three Year Program-Airman Apprentice Training," but not NCF Program. Accordingly, enlistment guarantees on Annexes "A" and "B" to her DD Form 4 were superseded by those listed on Annex "C". DD Form 1966 is the official document used to identify enlistment guarantees. Review of [REDACTED] DD Form 1966 revealed all guarantees, original and annexes, were appropriately documented. HM2 [REDACTED] reviewed and initialed her DD Form 1966 on 5 October 1994 acknowledging she understood no other guarantees would be made to her other than those listed on that form and DD Form 4 annexes. HM2 [REDACTED] also reviewed and signed her DD Form 4 annexes and again, NCF Program was not listed. No evidence of

Subj: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ICO [REDACTED]

counseling or administrative inconsistencies pertaining to enlistment guarantees exists in her record justifying relief. HT2 [REDACTED] is not entitled to receive the NCF Program.

2. [REDACTED] elected to enroll in the Montgomery GI Bill (MGIB) Program. The present educational assistance benefit for in-service use is limited to the actual cost of tuition and fees. When [REDACTED] receives an Honorable discharge, she will receive 36 months of educational benefits. The current rate for full time school enrollment is \$536 per month. The monthly entitlement is adjusted yearly based on the Consumer Price Index.

3. PERS-604's point of contact is Mr. [REDACTED] who can be reached at (C) 901-874-4246 or (DSN) 882-4246.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Commander, U.S. Navy
Deputy Director, Navy Drug &
Alcohol, Fitness, Education, and
Partnerships Division (PERS-60)
Acting